

JAN 29 2007

U.S.S.N. 10/695,723

4

PD-970227B

REMARKS

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for considering the present application. In the Office Action dated January 3, 2007, claims 1-5 are pending in the application. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner for a reconsideration of the rejections.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Rosen (U.S. Pat. No. 4,831,619) in view of Dutta (U.S. Pat. No. 6,301,232). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites integrating an area-wide broadcast downlink beam to be used to support point-to-point transmissions of one or more of the multiple spot beams whose transmission capacity has been exhausted. The Examiner points to column 4, lines 30-41, Fig. 9, zones 31, 33, 35 and 37 as well as column 2, lines 19-40. Applicants admit that point-to-point and broadcast service is provided in the *Rosen* reference as described in column 4.

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that Rosen does not explicitly show that the downlink beam is used to support point-to-point transmissions of one or more of the multiple spot beams whose transmission capacity has been exhausted. The Examiner then points to column 7, lines 18-43 of the Dutta reference for his teaching. However, Applicants have reviewed this portion and can find no teaching or suggestion for point-to-point or multiple spot beams. More specifically, there is no teaching or suggestion for point-to-point transmissions of one or more multiple spot beams whose transmission capacity has been exhausted. In fact, the Dutta reference appears to teach bi-directional channel groups; a typical beam includes multiple channels therein. That is, the frequency range of a beam of a satellite typically includes channels that are portions of the beam frequencies. It appears that the teaching in column 7, lines 18-43,

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

U.S.S.N. 10/695,723

5

JAN 29 2007

PD-970227B

merely teach adding return channels to a channel group. There is no teaching or suggestion for multiple spot beams or point-to-point transmissions in this passage.

Therefore, the Dutta reference does not teach or suggest that the downlink beam is used to support the point-to-point transmissions of one or more multiple spot beams whose transmission capacity has been exhausted. The combination of the Rosen and Dutta references fails to teach or suggest the combination. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the rejection of claim 1.

Claims 2-5 depend upon allowable independent claim 1 and are also allowable for at least the reasons set forth above.

CONCLUSION

In light of the remarks above, Applicants submit that all rejections are now overcome. The application is now in condition for allowance and expeditious notice thereof is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Should any fees be associated with this submission, please charge Deposit Account 50-0383.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 29, 2007

By: 

Georgann S. Grunebach, Reg. No. 33,179
Attorney for Applicants

The DIRECTV Group, Inc.
CA/LA1/A109
2230 East Imperial Highway
P.O. Box 956
El Segundo, CA 90245
Telephone: (310) 964-4615